



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE HON. JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN.

---

GRATEFUL appreciation of the services and veneration for the character of a distinguished statesman has overcome the reluctance belonging to a consciousness of inability to do adequate justice to the theme. A long personal acquaintance would enable me to say much learned in friendly intercourse, but I shall rely upon those official records which are within the reach of all who choose to consult them.

No public man has been more misunderstood and misrepresented than Mr. Calhoun. Not unfrequently he has been described as a "hair-splitting abstractionist," a "sectionist" and a "disunionist." That he was eminently wise and practical, that his heart and his mind embraced the whole country, that he was ardently devoted to the Union of the constitution as our Fathers made and construed it, his official acts and published speeches clearly demonstrate.

The subject of this sketch was of Scotch-Irish descent, a stock characterized by sturdy integrity, intrepidity, and intellectual vigor. They have been represented in our history by Presidents Monroe and Jackson, and many distinguished in the civil and military service.

Mr. Calhoun was born in 1782, the last year of the Revolutionary War, and while negotiations were pending which terminated in the treaty of peace, recognizing the declared sovereignty and independence of the several States, late colonies of Great Britain.

At the time of his birth the State of his nativity, South Carolina, was a member of the confederacy styled the "United States of America," being bound by articles of confederation and perpetual union between the States enumerated. Rocked in the cradle of the Revolution, his earliest years amid the shouts of a

people triumphant in their liberation from foreign rule, and the enjoyment of community independence, may he not fairly be regarded as having imbibed with his first sensations the belief in State rights, maintained with such ardent devotion in defiance of all the clamor which pursued him to the end of his life, and stops not even at his grave?

Reared in a rural district of South Carolina, with such preparation as the country schools of that day could give, he entered Yale College and was graduated with distinction, evincing at that early period the exact and analytic character of his mind by a special proficiency in mathematics. He read law as a profession, but practiced little, and at an early age became the representative of his district in the House of Representatives of the Legislature of his State, and subsequently a Representative in the Congress of the United States. He entered the House of Representatives in 1811, a period of intense excitement, of depredations upon our commerce, and upon the rights of seamen, citizens of the United States, which had aroused a just spirit of resistance. The policy of non-intercourse no longer satisfied the prouder spirits among our people; but, timidity and selfishness magnifying the danger of conflict with Great Britain, contended both in and out of Congress for further toleration of the ills we had, sooner than brave "those we knew not of." It was such a time as this that naturally brought forward men who loved their country, their *whole* country, and who would as soon fight for the commerce and sailors of New England as if they had belonged to their own State or section; and thus it was that, foremost of those who advocated defiance to Great Britain, and war with all its consequences, stood Calhoun of South Carolina and Clay of Kentucky. So ardent and effective were Calhoun's invocations as to cause a jeer to be thrown at those advocating the protection of our sailors, as "back-woodsmen who never saw a ship till convened here." Mr. Calhoun claimed that such sympathy was commendable, and said: "It constitutes our real Union, the rest is form; the wonder is, in fact, on the other side. Since it cannot be denied that American citizens are held in foreign bondage, how strange that those who boast of being neighbors and relations should be dead to all sympathy." In his speech December 12th, 1811, he put to his opponents the searching question: "Which shall we do, abandon or defend our commercial and maritime rights and the personal liberties of our

citizens employed in exercising them ?” Again he answered to the excuse of those who opposed preparation for war by representing the defenseless state of the country for which the majority, not the minority, was to be held responsible, and said : “It is no less the duty of the minority than a majority to endeavor to defend the country. For that purpose we are sent here and not for that of opposition.” In the same spirit of broad patriotism he rebuked those who were pleading against the necessary expense which would attend armed opposition. “But it may be, and I believe was said, that the people will not pay taxes, because the rights violated are not worth defending ; for that the defense will cost more than the gain. Sir, I enter my solemn protest. . . . There is, sir, one principle necessary to make us a great people—to produce not the form, but the real spirit of union—and that is to protect every citizen in the lawful pursuit of his business.”

After the war of 1812 had been successfully ended, to which success Calhoun, in civil life, and his compatriot, Jackson, in the army, had been recognized as mainly contributing, we see him laboring with the same zeal, though under different form, for the general welfare and common defense.

On January 31st, 1816, referring to the condition and future prospects of the country, he thus spoke : “We are now called upon to determine what amount of revenue is necessary for this country in time of peace. This involves the additional question, What are the measures which the true interests of the country demand ?” Treating of the defense of the country on land, he advocated a regular draft from the body of the people in preference to recruiting an army by individual enlistment, and of the latter said : “Uncertain, slow in its operation, and expensive, it draws from society only its worst materials, introducing into our army, of necessity, all the severities which are exercised in that of the most despotic governments. . Thus composed, our armies, in a great degree, lose that enthusiasm with which citizen soldiers, conscious of liberty and fighting in defense of their country, have ever been animated.” Then, with the same deep concern for every interest of the broad Union to which he was proud to belong, he proceeded to discuss material questions as follows : “I shall now proceed to a point of less, but still of great importance—I mean the establishing of roads and the opening of canals through various parts of the country.” Referring to the

widely dispersed condition of our population, and the difficulty in the then condition of the country of collecting the military means at a menaced point, he said : "The people are brave, great, and spirited, but they must be brought together in sufficient numbers, and with a certain promptitude, to enable them to act with effect. . . . Let us make great permanent roads ; not like the Romans, with views of subjecting and ruling provinces, but for the more honorable purpose of defense and of connecting more closely the interests of various sections of this great country." This he enforced by reference to the embarrassments felt for the want of facilities in transportation during the preceding war, and then proceeded to consider what encouragement could properly be given to the industry of the country. He said : "In regard to the question, How far manufactures ought to be fostered, it is the duty of this country, as a means of defense, to encourage its domestic industry, 'more especially that part of it which provides the necessary materials for clothing and defense. . . . Laying the claims of manufacturers entirely out of view, on general principles, without regard to their interests, a certain encouragement should be extended at least to our woollen and cotton manufactures." After the war of the Revolution, it will be remembered that President Washington recommended special encouragement for the manufacture of materials requisite in time of war, and indicated the payment of bounties for the same. A like experience of the sufferings of the defenders of the country during the suspension of foreign trade suggested to both the propriety of guarding against such want in the future. Mr. Calhoun, in the same speech, called attention to the preparation which should be made for the defense of our coast and navigable rivers, and answered the argument which was opposed to the taxation which would be required, that it would impair the moral power of the country, and in that connection said : "Let us examine the question, whether a tax laid for the defense, security, and lasting prosperity of a country is calculated to destroy its moral power, and more especially of this country. If such be the fact, indispensable as I believe these taxes to be, I would relinquish them ; for of all the powers of the Government, the power of a moral kind is most to be cherished. We had better give up all our physical power than part with this. But what is moral power ? The zeal of the country and the confidence it reposes in the administration of its government."

After stating the obligation of the representatives as agents of the people, and their duty to influence their constituents to agree to whatever sacrifices were necessary for the security and prosperity of the country, he said : " I know of no situation so responsible, if properly considered, as ours. We are charged by Providence, not only with the happiness of this great and rising people, but, in a considerable degree, with that of the human race. We have a government of a new order, perfectly distinct from all others which have preceded it—a government founded on the rights of man ; resting, not on authority, not on prejudice, not on superstition, but reason. If it shall succeed, as fondly hoped by its founders, it will be the commencement of a new era in human affairs." To men of the present day, the full significance of the argument of Mr. Calhoun for the encouragement of the manufactures which had grown up under the necessities of the war may not be appreciated in their anti-sectional character ; it may, therefore, be not inappropriate to say that it was before the invention of steamships and steam locomotives, and that the manufactures were almost exclusively in the Northern States, and it would have required prophetic vision to foresee their introduction into the land of Calhoun. Commerce was then conducted on the sea and in sailing vessels. A wide plain lay between the mountains of South Carolina and the sea. If the water-power at the base of the mountains had been utilized for purposes of manufacture, the transportation across the plain would have been too slow and expensive for a profitable commerce. Therefore, the agricultural products, chiefly in the country near to the sea, were transported in ships to places where the water-power was near to a harbor, and thus it will be seen that to advocate encouragement to the manufacturers was to benefit, not the people of his own section, but those far away from it, and that in this, as well as in his zealous efforts for the vindication of the rights of sailors, he rose above any considerations of sectional interest or feeling, and stood forward as the champion of his countrymen, to whatever State they might belong. I now submit it to any candid and intelligent reader whether I have not disproved the charge of sectionalism as made against Calhoun.

The services rendered by him in the House of Representatives during the war of 1812 and immediately thereafter, not merely by the ability he exhibited, but by the purity and patriotism

which characterized his course, gave to him a high reputation in every portion of the country. He was invited by Mr. Monroe and accepted a seat in his Cabinet as Secretary of War, but many of Mr. Calhoun's best friends objected to his accepting the appointment, believing that the parliamentary field was one for the labors of which he was peculiarly fitted. They underrated the universality of his genius. His administrative ability was soon exhibited in so marked a degree as to induce the belief that he was then in his most appropriate sphere. Many eminent men had occupied that post, and, without detracting from their merit, the fact must be noted that there was a want in the system of accountability and the general conduct of our military affairs, which was marked by a very large amount of unsettled accounts and more or less of confusion in all the operations of the department, which at that time included the conduct of our relations with the Indian tribes. Rapidly a system of accountability was established, so perfect as to require very little modification by his successors, at least for the next quarter of a century. Under that system default by disbursing officers of the War Department became a very rare exception, though new posts were being established on the remote frontier, requiring heavy expenditures beyond the limits of commercial facilities, and that the only foreign war in which our country has been engaged was also embraced within the period I have named. The exclusion of party considerations in appointments and preferments may not have originated, but was certainly perpetuated by him, so that the War Department and the officers of the old army were so far removed from political influence, and politics were so rarely discussed in army circles, that if an officer had been asked to what party one of his most intimate friends belonged, he probably would have answered that he could not tell.

It was during Mr. Calhoun's occupancy of the War Office that the system of seacoast defenses received its great impulse, and army discipline and instruction were nurtured by schools of practice. In this, as in every other public office he held, a broad and comprehensive view of the general interests of the country, together with a strict observance of the powers and limitation conferred by the Constitution on the Government of the United States, was the polar star by which his course was directed. At the close of his service in the War Office the popular verdict was that

he had done well in all his stewardship, and should go up still higher. Thus, by a rare unanimity, in 1824, he was elected Vice-President, at a time when many candidates for the Presidency divided the people into earnestly contending parties.

Thus the breath of life was breathed into the Union. It was created by the States, its purposes and powers expressly enumerated and restricted by the compact. The Constitution was the soul, the form of government the body of the Union. Whoso adhered to the Constitution, and maintained its validity, defending its principles and upholding its purposes, was a friend of the Union, and he who perverted it from its declared purposes, thus breaking the only bond which held the States together, was logically and criminally a disunionist. To claim, because he still adhered to the form of the government, that he was, therefore, a friend of the Union of the States is as if the man who should take the life of his neighbor could, by embalming his body, prove himself to have been his friend.

In the beginning of Mr. Calhoun's career we find him the champion of the honor and independence of the United States, and subsequently advocating a policy of a tariff and internal improvements as a means of providing for the common defense. His patriotism and generosity caused him to overlook the danger which lurked beneath measures which, distorted from their real purpose, could be made to serve the aggrandizement of one section, the impoverishment of another, and taxation, not for common defense, but for the benefit of individuals and corporations. In this, as in other instances of his public career, we find evidence of the extent to which his broad patriotism, generosity, and purity engendered a confidence which never proved misplaced. When abuses, progressing in geometrical ratio, warned him of the evils which threatened the perpetuity of the Union; he labored assiduously, even unto the end of his life, to point out the danger and invoke the application of appropriate remedies. It is but justice to him to say that his ardent devotion to the Union of the Constitution was the source of whatever his friends will admit were the errors of his political life, and it is a tribute to his elevated nature that he did not anticipate all that sordid avarice and narrow selfishness would build on the small foundation which patriotic credulity had laid.

Imposts designed to provide revenue, like the costs of trans-



portation from foreign countries, were of advantage, and served to encourage home manufactures, and in so far as the benefit thus resulted to individuals in any of the States, Mr. Calhoun did not object ; but when duties were made, not to provide the means necessary for the support of government, but were discriminations intended solely for the profit of particular classes—*this* was not the scheme to which he had ever given favor ; and then he invoked the Constitution as the shield of the minority to protect it against oppression. In pointing out the landmarks of the fathers, and showing how they were being obliterated, and the tendency of such crime to produce disunion, he was not expressing a thought which originated in desire, but warning those who, he hoped, would, like himself, recoil from the approach of so great a disaster, that they might, in time, retrace their steps, and, before it was too late, avert the threatened calamity. He was too wise to ignore how many and grievous would be the consequences of disrupting the bonds which held the States together ; not only the compact, but the traditions, memories, and historical glories which cemented them as a family together. To those who knew him well, and remember how regardless he was of his personal safety, when, with a disease that was rapidly carrying him to the grave, he rejected all solicitation to remain quietly at home, and came, at an eventful period, to renew his labors in defense of the Constitution and the preservation of the Union, it must seem absurdly strange that currency could have been obtained for a report that he desired to destroy a confederation to which his life had been devoted, and in the annals of which all his glories were recorded. This may, perhaps, be due to the fact that the unreflecting have confounded nullification with disunion, when, in point of fact, the idea of nullification, so far as South Carolina is concerned, was adopted as a remedy *within* the Union. The hope was, by State interposition, to induce the call of a convention of States, to which would be submitted the constitutional question of laying duties ; otherwise, imposing taxes upon the whole people for the benefit of a particular class. The question to be presented was, What was the proper limit of the powers delegated by the States to the general government ? All else was expressly reserved to the States or the people. The phrase “the people” necessarily meant the people of the several States, as there were no other people known to the Constitution. The language must have been intended to con-

vey the State governments and the people of the States so far as they possessed rights and powers with which their governments had not been invested. The whole proceeding of South Carolina was on the ground that the Constitution did not authorize the general government to impose and collect duties on imports for the benefit of manufacturers, *i. e.*, a protective, not a revenue tariff. In this connection Mr. Calhoun referred to the constitutional provision for amendment, and it was in the nature of his profound intellect to believe that, if the States were assembled in convention, any imperfection which experience had proved to exist would be remedied, and additional safeguards provided to protect the people from the usurpations of government. It would be needless to inquire, in the light shed by the experience of 1860 and 1861, especially of the peace congress, whether that hope would have been realized. I am now treating of the question as it was presented to his mind and that of his associates. Thus it is evident that their remedy looked, not to a dissolution of the Union, but to the purification of its general government, the happiness and contentment of the people, and the perpetuity of their fraternal relations. No more dangerous and vicious heresy has grown up than the supposition that ours is a government made and controlled by a majority of the people of the United States *en masse*.

Let us now examine the odious and unfounded accusation that he was a disunionist.

To the clear understanding of the charge it is necessary, in the first place, to define the true meaning of the word "union." The history of its formation irrefutably proves that it was a confederation of Sovereign States, each acting separately and for itself alone. The States so agreeing to unite entered into a compact styled "The Constitution of the United States of America." This constitution was declared to be binding between the States ratifying the same, and that "The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of the constitution between the States so ratifying the same."—Art. VII.

The men who founded our constitutional government were too profound as statesmen and philosophers, after having achieved their independence of Great Britain, to transfer the liberties they had acquired to the control of a majority of the people, *en masse*. The most careless reading of the Constitution, and the laws enacted

to carry out its provisions, will show there is not a department or officer of the Federal Government who derives power and authority from a majority of the people of the United States. The power of amending the Constitution was given to the States, not to the people collectively. From the speech of Mr. Calhoun delivered in the Senate February 15th and 16th, 1833, I make the following extract :

“To maintain the ascendancy of the Constitution over the law-making majority is the great and essential point on which the success of the system must depend. Unless that ascendancy can be preserved, the necessary consequence must be that the laws will supersede the Constitution ; and finally, the will of the executive, by the influence of his patronage, will supersede the laws ; indications of which are already perceptible. This ascendancy can only be preserved through the action of the States as organized bodies, having their own separate governments, and possessed of the right, under the structure of our system, of judging of the extent of their separate powers, and of interposing their authority to arrest the unauthorized enactments of the general government within their respective limits.” Additional evidence could be abundantly offered that nullification was intended to conserve, not to destroy the Union, and in the manner proposed to secure a remedy short of secession. It would be unfair to judge of the practicability of the plan by the state of the country at a subsequent date, and we must presume that it was more feasible in 1833 than it was in 1860.

In 1850, during the long and exciting debate over what was known as the compromise measures of that year, Mr. Calhoun was generally confined to his lodgings, being too ill and debilitated to occupy his seat in the Senate. In that condition he wrote the speech read for him to the Senate on March 4th, 1850. It was the effort of a dying man whose affections clung so tenaciously to the Union he had long and faithfully served, that, though unable to deliver the speech, he submitted the MSS. to the Senate. To him earthly ambition was a thing of the past, but the love of truth and justice, devotion to the cause of liberty, and hopes for the people's welfare and happiness under the Constitution, all of which could not die, sustained his sinking frame for this last supreme effort in his country's cause. A few brief extracts from that speech are here inserted.

Referring to the supposition of States held together by force, he said :

“ It may indeed keep them connected ; but the connection will partake much more of the character of subjugation, on the part of the weaker to the stronger, than the union of free, independent, and sovereign States in one confederation as they stood in the early stages of the government, and which only is worthy of the sacred name of Union.” Then, referring to frequent eulogies on the Union, he said :

“ It usually comes from our assailants. But we cannot believe them to be sincere ; for, if they loved the Union, they would necessarily be devoted to the Constitution. It made the Union, and to destroy the Constitution would be to destroy the Union.”

The day after the reading of the speech from which these extracts have been made, a Senator made a speech in review, Mr. Calhoun being absent ; but, when his colleague, Mr. Butler, had commenced a reply Mr. Calhoun came in. After expressing his regret that a member of the body should have commented upon his speech during his absence and before the hour for the consideration of the question under discussion, he said : “ I had not the advantage of hearing the remarks of the Senator of Mississippi. Did he accuse me of disunion ? Did he mean to insinuate that ? ” To which Mr. Foote, the Senator referred to, replied that he “ had not the slightest intention to impute to him designs hostile to the Union.” . . . “ I have always maintained that he is one of the most devoted friends of the Union in this body.”

The evident purpose for which the question was put was to answer the charge or insinuation, if made, by the most emphatic denunciation. This was the last time Mr. Calhoun appeared in the United States Senate. Death had laid its icy hand upon him ; he was aware of the near approach, and with the heroism of a martyr strove with his last breath to bear testimony to the faith in which he had lived and labored.

If a young man should ask me where he could, in a condensed form, get the best understanding of our institutions and the duties of an American patriot, I would answer, “ In Calhoun’s speech in the Senate on what is known as ‘ The Force Bill. ’ ”

No one has so fully and clearly expounded the Constitution, no one has so steadily invoked a strict observance of it, as the

means of securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, for which the more perfect Union was formed. It required neither his dying assertion nor the testimony of others to exculpate him from the charge of desiring to destroy our Constitutional Union. His whole life speaks trumpet-tongued denial.

Another accusation was his inconsistency—to which it may be briefly answered, he was practical as well as logical, and was consistent to principle, to truth, to the Constitution, and to the duties of a patriot. Consistency as to measures when every day brings forth unforetold phases could honestly belong only to one having more than human foresight, or to one having less than human capacity to learn.

The questions agitating the country to such degree as to threaten convulsion were the subjects under discussion when Mr. Calhoun last addressed the Senate. They were the slavery and territorial questions. Long he had foreseen and given warning of the danger of the hostile and unconstitutional interference with the domestic institution of African servitude. The States having that institution had become a minority and claimed the protection which the compact of Union had expressly promised to give.

In regard to the territories outside of the limits of any State, there were three divisions of opinion. The one, that they belonged to the United States, and consequently that the citizens of every State, with every species of property recognized by the United States, had equal right therein; another, that they belonged to the immigrants who should settle thereon; and another, that the United States Government had proprietary right over them. This last form of opinion, which has grown with the political decadence of our time, was, in 1850, the least dangerous, because it was then, as it is now, the least defensible. The general government was formed to be the agent of the States for specific purposes and with enumerated powers; it was penniless, could only collect revenue as the agent of the States, and as the agent of the States only had the means or authority to acquire anything. The authority conferred upon Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States applied equally to the public lands within the new States as to the outlying territories, save and except such regulations as might be necessary in the outlying territories with a

view to the exercise of the granted power. The arguments of Mr. Calhoun were directed to support the first-named opinion and to demonstrate the fallacy of the other two. His proposition was maintained with the conclusiveness of a mathematical demonstration, but we shall be verging on the millennium when reason shall prevail over passion and prejudice, and the lust of dominion shall yield to truth and justice: it was a contest of might and right.

The permitted limit of this article does not allow me to follow the career of this great statesman through that period when he sacrificed personal ambition and party ties to lead the few against the many, in defense of truth, justice, and the liberty the Union was formed to secure and perpetuate. Exposing himself as a target to serried ranks of foes, he stood like a sentinel on the watch-tower warning the people he loved.

In my early manhood I enjoyed the personal acquaintance of Mr. Calhoun, and perhaps received especial consideration from the fact that, as Secretary of War, he had appointed me a cadet in the United States Military Academy. In 1845, as a member of the House of Representatives, I frequently visited Mr. Calhoun, who was then a Senator, at his residence. His conversation was always instructive and peculiarly attractive. The great question of the day was on giving notice to Great Britain of a termination of the joint occupation of Oregon. He and his colleague, the brilliant orator McDuffie, did not fully concur, as I had occasion to learn, being one of several in a private consultation. There was great excitement in the country, and there was believed to be imminent danger of a war with Great Britain. Under these circumstances, Mr. Calhoun, though in such feeble health as to require rest, responded to the call for his services in the Senate, and went to Washington to labor in the cause of peace. War was to him an evil which only defense of the honor and rights of his country would justify. That state of the case made him the advocate of the war of 1812, but, in 1845, he saw no such justification, and was, therefore, in favor of negotiation, by which he believed war could be averted without the surrender of the rights of our country.

As a Senator he was a model of courtesy. He politely listened to each one who spoke, neither reading nor writing when in his seat, and as long as his health permitted was punctual and con-

stant in his attendance. His correspondence was conducted by rising at dawn and writing before breakfast. Issues growing out of the disposal of the public lands within the States occupied much of the time of Congress, and for this and more important reasons he proposed, on certain conditions, to surrender the public lands to the new States in which they lay. This was but another exhibition of his far-reaching patriotism and wisdom, as shown in his argument for the measure.

Always earnest, often intense in debate, he was never rhetorical, seldom sought the aid of illustration, simile, or quotation, but, concisely and in logical sequence, stated his views like one demonstrating a problem, the truth of which was so clear to his mind that he did not doubt its acceptance by all who listened to the proof. Perhaps he was too little of a party man to believe, as the English parliamentarian did, that opinions might be, but votes were never changed by a speech.

Wide as was his knowledge, great as was his foresight, reaching toward the domain of prophecy, his opinions were little derived from books or from conversation. Data he gathered on every hand, but the conclusions were the elaboration of his brain—as much his own as is honey not of the leaf, but of the bag of the bee. He paid little attention to style—probably undervalued it; words were to him merely the medium to convey his thoughts, and these flowed on unbroken and with the resistless power of a mighty river.

The death of Mr. Calhoun, though anticipated by those who saw him, with tottering steps, enter the Senate Chamber for the last time, and feebly struggle to repel misconstruction, created the deep impression which his high and reverend character commanded. His great political antagonist, Mr. Webster, had always been his personal friend; they were born in the same year, 1782. There was a custom in the old Senate that, at the beginning of each session, Senators should give one another a friendly salutation as evidence that past controversies were buried. On one occasion I remember that Mr. Webster approached Mr. Calhoun, and with cordial greeting said: "How do the men of '82 stand on their pins?" When the death was announced in the Senate, Mr. Webster said: "I think there is not one of us, when he last addressed us from his seat in the Senate, who did not feel that he might imagine that we saw before us a Senator of Rome, when

Rome survived. . . . He had the basis, the indispensable basis of all high character, and that was unspotted integrity—unimpeached honor and character. If he had aspirations, they were high, and honorable, and noble. There was nothing groveling, or low, or meanly selfish that came near the head or the heart of Calhoun. . . . We shall delight to speak of him to those who are rising up to fill our places. And when the time shall come that we ourselves shall go, one after another, in succession, to our graves, we shall carry with us a deep sense of his genius and character, his honor and integrity, his amiable deportment in private life, and the purity of his exalted patriotism.”

JEFFERSON DAVIS.